

right or to the left of it, and each elastic tie-member has its own antipode".

However, the aforementioned amendment contains no new subject matter, since it is known commonly from human anatomy that the principles of anatomical arrangement of the skeletal muscles reside in a strict symmetry with respect to the spinal column, which is thus the matter of the present claims.

The same refers equally to the word "antipode" which is synonymous to the word "antagonist".

Again, it is respectfully pointed out that the explanatory material for the aforestated claims as to how the elastic tie-members simulate the various muscles, is according to the principle of anatomical arrangement of the skeletal muscles.

It is respectfully noted that it is the subject matter of the present claims that makes it possible to fix the patient's trunk and limbs in a position approximating the physiological parameters and resulting in the onset of a moment of force that contributes to flexion, extension, rotation, adduction, and abduction of the limbs and trunk.

Also, the Examiner's observation that the buckle construction is disclosed neither in the specification nor in the drawings, is traversed as follows.

As follows from the specification of the present invention, the so-called buckle is essentially a lock that is one of the construction elements of the tension adjuster. Thus, the lock (buckle) is part of the mechanism for adjusting the tension of the shock-absorbers (elastic tie-members) and its construction is of no fundamental importance. Thus, the lock may be of any suitable construction. The interrelation between the tension adjuster and the lock is the matter of consideration of the specification of the present invention (see lines 2-9 on page 6 of Specification).

The fact that the lock may appear as a buckle with a square frame is not the matter of the claims.

Thus, it is believed that the Amendment filed on March 8, 1996, does not contain any new matter.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 132 is respectfully requested.

Submitted herewith is documentary evidence for evaluation of the novelty and the importance of the present invention along with the unobviousness of the present invention.

The evidence submitted is of the important use and the success gained by the structure claimed in the invention. There was a prolonged demand due to numerous but unsuccessful attempts to solve the medical problems by the prior art technology. The unexpected success of the invention for solving the described medical problems is due to high efficiency of the present invention.

The enclosed evidence of unexpected success for the present invention corresponds to the scope of the claims as now presented.

The enclosed documents are presented as very cogent evidence of the nonobviousness of the claimed invention as follows:

EXHIBIT A (September 1992 to February 1993);
EXHIBIT B (March 15 to April 28, 1993);
EXHIBIT C (April 10 to April 29, 1994);
EXHIBIT D (March to July 1995);
EXHIBIT E (October 18, 1995 to November 9, 1995); and
EXHIBIT F (1995).

Based upon this Preliminary Response, entry and

consideration of these documents are respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as priority mail in an envelope addressed to:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS,
Washington, D.C. 20231, on September 18, 1996.

Date: September 18, 1996


Maureen Bitz

1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Enclosures: EXHIBITS A through F
September 18, 1996

1700prel.amd

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI I. AFANASANKO ET AL.


Allison C. Collard
Edward R. Freedman
Registration No. 26,048
COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicants